

UNREDACTED VERSION REFILED PURSUANT TO DKTS. 253, 320, 325-5
ORIGINALLY FILED AT DKT. 281-71

Exhibit 55

From: Ori Hanegby </O=THEFACEBOOK/OU=EXTERNAL (FYDIBOHF25SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=DA41622B99AC481DB2E80C38F80CD28B>
To: Ori Hanegby; Yaron Fidler
Sent: 10/10/2018 3:40:11 PM
Subject: Message summary [{"otherUserFbId":100022687626439,"threadFbId":null}]

Ori Hanegby (10/10/2018 14:26:15 PDT):

>I had follow up emails with Yi about reach estimations since last night as well.

Ori Hanegby (10/10/2018 14:27:03 PDT):

>I didn't get the last answer from him yet but my position is that we should first answer what is the number that we want to show and based on that decide what's the right implementation

Ori Hanegby (10/10/2018 14:27:41 PDT):

>There are several options:

>1. Facebook Monthly Active Users (all of them)

>2. Number of users eligible to see ads

>3. Number of users that we expect to see ads

Ori Hanegby (10/10/2018 14:28:24 PDT):

>it sounds like we are saying (3), Yi is saying (2) and R&F are saying (1)

Ori Hanegby (10/10/2018 14:28:58 PDT):

>I'd like to decouple the discussion from understanding the gap between ad requests and impressions.

Yaron Fidler (10/10/2018 15:14:19 PDT):

>We are saying 2 as well

Yaron Fidler (10/10/2018 15:14:24 PDT):

>Today 2 is wrong

Yaron Fidler (10/10/2018 15:14:38 PDT):

>No one say 3. That's outcome prediction

Ori Hanegby (10/10/2018 15:20:22 PDT):

>moving to impressions is bringing us closer to number 3 rather than 2

Ori Hanegby (10/10/2018 15:20:29 PDT):

>that's Yi's point

Yaron Fidler (10/10/2018 15:21:26 PDT):

>Nope, it's still 2. Today we are between 1 and 2

Ori Hanegby (10/10/2018 15:22:11 PDT):

>the fact that someone didn't see an impression doesn't mean that they are not eligible

Yaron Fidler (10/10/2018 15:22:49 PDT):

>If we know there is a constant and stable X% gap between the people we count that can see an ad and the people that actually saw an ad, and that number doesn't change then we are today not providing 2

Yaron Fidler (10/10/2018 15:23:15 PDT):

>Listen, the discussion is not about that user or another user, it's the overall number

Yaron Fidler (10/10/2018 15:23:35 PDT):

>The whole discussion breaks down when you talk about a specific user

Ori Hanegby (10/10/2018 15:24:50 PDT):

>I'm talking about the overall number. That's why it's important to clearly articulate what the number is and apply the best solution. If we want to know how many people are eligible to see ads, we can get this number in multiple ways

Ori Hanegby (10/10/2018 15:25:07 PDT):

>ad request is one option and an implementation detail

Yaron Fidler (10/10/2018 15:25:20 PDT):

>As a topline number, if you there is a constant gap between the number we provide and the number of people that actually see an ad then our estimation of eligible must be wrong

Ori Hanegby (10/10/2018 15:25:45 PDT):

>it's all about the definition of "eligible"

Yaron Fidler (10/10/2018 15:26:03 PDT):

>I'm about to give up on this discussion

Yaron Fidler (10/10/2018 15:26:38 PDT):

>I honestly can't understand how you changed your mind from "This must be fixed" to this philosophical discussion

Ori Hanegby (10/10/2018 15:27:06 PDT):

>I didn't change my mind and the discussion is not philosophical

Ori Hanegby (10/10/2018 15:27:36 PDT):

>gaps between ads requests and impressions needs to be well understood regardless of reach estimations and if there is an issue it must be fixed

Yaron Fidler (10/10/2018 15:27:42 PDT):

>I mean, we are clearly overestimating. We know that... For crying out loud, R&F have a cap on the percentage of an audience size that can be reached because of this problem

Ori Hanegby (10/10/2018 15:28:17 PDT):

>You know that my opinion is that we need to move to "max lifetime reach" which is closer to (3) and impressions based reach is a step in this direction

Yaron Fidler (10/10/2018 15:28:24 PDT):

>gaps between ads requests and impressions needs to be well understood regardless of reach estimations and if there is an issue it must be fixed - Agreed! Also unrelated

Ori Hanegby (10/10/2018 15:34:03 PDT):

>Today we don't really understand the eligibility of people to see ads. We don't understand why they send ads requests and end up not seeing ads. Given that a lot of them are not very active, we don't even know if there is any chance they should see an ad

Ori Hanegby (10/10/2018 15:34:59 PDT):

>The point that Yi is raising is that we need to identify who are the people who CAN see ads and count them as well.

Yaron Fidler (10/10/2018 15:35:37 PDT):

>Yeah, and the way to estimate that is by seeing who saw an impression

Yaron Fidler (10/10/2018 15:35:54 PDT):

>For sure not who sent an ad request

Yaron Fidler (10/10/2018 15:36:13 PDT):

>This is a lawsuit waiting to happen

Yaron Fidler (10/10/2018 15:36:27 PDT):

>Exactly the same as video watch time

Ori Hanegby (10/10/2018 15:37:18 PDT):

>if you have 1000 people, each one of them 50% chance to see an ad and only one visit each, the number of impressions would be 500. The overall number of people eligible to see an ad should still be 1000

Yaron Fidler (10/10/2018 15:38:15 PDT):

>No! It's not. It's like saying that you define a video view only if it's longer than 3 seconds

Yaron Fidler (10/10/2018 15:38:23 PDT):

>It's arbitrary

Ori Hanegby (10/10/2018 15:38:53 PDT):

>that's why the definition of "eligible" is extremely important. Yi claims it should be what I wrote above

Ori Hanegby (10/10/2018 15:39:27 PDT):

>if it should be 500, than it's the upper bound on the number of people who are EXPECTED to see an ad

Yaron Fidler (10/10/2018 15:39:42 PDT):

>The product is called potential reach...

Yaron Fidler (10/10/2018 15:40:03 PDT):

>I give up, have to run... See you tomorrow

Ori Hanegby (10/10/2018 15:40:11 PDT):

>see you tomorrow